

Remarks

The present application includes claims 1-25. Claims 1-20 have been rejected by the Examiner. By this Response, claims 3-7 and 10-11 have been amended; claims 1-2, 8-9, and 12-18 have been cancelled; and new claims 19-25 have been added.

Claims 1-11 and 12-18 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Jackson et al. As discussed above, claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 12-18 are hereby cancelled, new claims 19 to 25 added and claims 3 – 7, 10 and 11 amended. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as it applies to the present pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Jackson et al describes a progressive jackpot slot machine, or group of slot machines, where multiple progressive jackpots may be won (see, e.g., page 1, lines 21-22). Entitlement to win a jackpot if a special symbol combination is obtained depends on the number of coins bet on the relevant game (see, e.g., page 1, line 22 – page 2, line 12).

Jackson et al describes various embodiments, including:

- Three different progressive jackpots, each jackpot being accumulated at a different rate (page 4, lines 6-11).
- Each jackpot is based upon allocating a percentage of each amount bet by the players of the group of slot machines (page 4, lines 12-19, page 5, lines 7-13).
- A jackpot win may be a single jackpot or the total of all jackpots (page 6, lines 1-5).

In each embodiment, each bet wagered increments all of the various jackpots. Referring to the specific embodiment described on page 2, lines 6-13 and on page 5, lines 7-13, all wagers contribute 0.5% to a first progressive jackpot, 1% to a second

progressive jackpot and 2% to a third progressive jackpot. The other embodiments described by Jackson et al relate to variations in the percentages applied to each jackpot, as indicated on page 2, lines 8-13.

Referring to new claim 19 of the present application, this claim includes the features of:

- *a plurality of different wagers that can be staked on an outcome of the game;*
- *a plurality of jackpot prizes and select only one jackpot prize from a plurality of jackpot prizes as an eligible prize based on the one of the plurality of different wagers selected to be staked on the outcome of the game;*
- *increment only the eligible jackpot prize.*

Therefore, as described by example on page 5, lines 4 to 13 and page 5, line 16 to page 6, line 4 of the present application, each jackpot prize is contributed to only when a particular wager is staked. Jackson et al does not disclose different valued wagers resulting in contributions to different jackpots.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is allowable over Jackson et al at least for these differences. In particular, Jackson et al describes contributing to all jackpots in response to a wager and determining the eligibility to win based on the wager. This is in contrast to claim 19, where the wager determines which jackpot(s) are contributed to and which jackpots are eligible to be won.

Similarly, nothing in Jackson et al teaches or suggests the limitations recited in new claims 22 and 24. As discussed above, Jackson et al discloses incrementing all jackpots in response to a wager, in contrast to the invention claimed in claims 22 and 24,

which includes making *a selection of less than all of the jackpots* with the selection being made *in response to the staking of a said wager by the player*, and with *the selection changing dependent on which of the plurality of different possible wagers was staked or the value of the staked wager*.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 3-7, 10-11, and 19-25 should be allowable over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. However, the Applicants expressly reserve the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in a rejection of any current or future claim).

It is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicant can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the Applicant at the number below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account of MHM, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2008

/Christopher N. George/
Christopher N. George
Reg. No. 51,728

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100